

Foreword

Every issue of *Colloquia* takes shape according to a similar structure – it begins with theoretical articles and ends with analyses of recent publications. Here again, while this issue’s authors probe the full range of nineteenth and twentieth century literary phenomena, ideological stances, and methodological attitudes, its editors seek to maintain a balance in the amount of attention dedicated to different literary periods (two articles each explore the interwar and Soviet periods, one looks at the literature of today) and to represent a maximal variety of methodological approaches (phenomenology, cultural psychology, sociology, translation theory, ecocriticism).

Jurgita Ivananauskaitė’s theoretical article presents Canadian author Linda Hutcheon’s concept of historical metafiction, which was little known in Lithuania until recently; the article seeks to offer an original interpretation of Hutcheon’s thought, connecting it to the lexicon of narratology and testing its suitability for analyzing (post)modern prose. Mindaugas Kvietkauskas and Erika Malažinskaitė look back at the dynamic and culturally productive period of the first Lithuanian Republic (1918–1940), which saw the genesis and proliferation of many elements vital to an emerging modern literature. Drawing on theories of cultural psychology and emotional history, Kvietkauskas reconstructs and compares the atmospheres around two very distinct Lithuanian literary societies – the neo-Catholic “Šatrija” and the left-leaning “Trečias frontas” – and the tensions between them in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Malažinskaitė’s empirically rich article examines the state of and developments in translation during the two decades of independence, identifying a shift from provincial insularity to cultural dialogue.

At the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore’s conference “The Literary Field Under the Communist Regime: Structure, Functions, *Illusio*” (October 7–9, 2015), the final accent was an international dialogue about methodological issues around literature of the Soviet period – a roundtable discussion that brought together authorities on the subject and generated conceptual momentum for continuing renewed interpretations of that epoch. Studies of the Soviet period are considered an important element in *Colloquia*, and this issue sees these explorations enriched by two articles that take innovative

approaches. Historian Vilius Ivanauskas focuses his attention on five Lithuanian Jewish writers and their attitudes during the Soviet period, identifying three different creative trajectories: 1) local assimilation; 2) maneuvering between Lithuania and Moscow; and 3) blending into Russian literature at the union level. In this interdisciplinary article the author devotes considerable attention to the question of how Soviet national politics and Jewish culture's lack of legitimacy affected the writers' work and their varying relations to local and Moscow (the Centre's) influences.

Inga Mitunevičiūtė's study draws on the ecological perspective, allowing her to identify the *atypical* in a typical work of Soviet children's literature (the pro-regime writer Vytautas Petkevičius's story *Didysis medžiotojas Mikas Pupkus* (The Great Hunter Mikas Pupkus, 1969), to ask what in it was contradictory and why. In her article "The Emergence of Personal Myth in the Essays of Dalia Staponkutė", Imelda Vedrickaitė studies the intertwining of elements of autobiography and contemporary global multiculturalism in two works by an author who migrates between Cyprus, Lithuania, and London. Inspired by literary phenomenology, the article echoes the philosophical style of the essays.

The Reviews section looks at three monographs and one collection of articles. Recognizing the monograph authors' subject mastery and their contribution to broadening understanding of their objects of study (advertising and poetry in a consumer society, (e)migration texts, images of urban literature), the three reviewers question and problematize more than one aspect of the studies they are examining (genre, methodology, structure, etc.). The reviewers draw attention to the most fundamental shifts within literary genre: some recent monographs no longer have coherent structures or central axes, which often overrides the claims made in their introductions. Rather than being a coherently constructed work, the monograph has become a patchwork of articles. This begs the question: will the contemporary diffusion of genre, the fashionable rejection of genre, and the rushed execution of these kinds of projects not eventually threaten the quality of academic discourse?

JŪRATĖ SPRINDYTĖ